



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,484	02/20/2002	Shell S. Simpson	10007664 -1	1490

7590 07/19/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/19/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,484	SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jungwon Chang	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17,18 and 24-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,3-10,12-15,17,18 and 24-29 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to amendment filed on 5/15/07. Claims 2, 11, 16 and 19-23 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-15, 17, 18 and 24-29 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood et al. (US 6,453,127), hereinafter Wood, in view of Wang (US 2003/0009537).**

4. As to claims 1, Wood discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a system, comprising:

a Web client computer (11, figs. 1 & 2) coupled to a network (12, fig. 1) (col. 2, lines 50-53) and operable by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents (col. 3, lines 11-22; col. 6, lines 35-40);

an interface for accessing the user's personal repository (col. 3, lines 11-65, "touch screen operation...select document files from storage...display line indicating the

operation selected, the job ID number/storage location for the location"); and a Web site (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) coupled to the network (12, fig. 1) (col. 2, lines 50-53) and operable to cause the client to display a Web page (fig. 4) that includes *information regarding* web resource that is available over the network (12, fig. 1); wherein each of the web resources make use of the same interface in order to access a user's personal repository (col. 3, lines 11-65, user interface display page for the printer 15...reprint operation gives user the ability to select document files from storage and print hard copy").

5. Wood discloses a web site (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) operable to cause the client to display a web page including *information* each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 1-34, "display of the downloaded document, which could be an initial printer screen page...to provide access to the copier/printer"). Although the web page is built with an html format (col. 5, lines 3-24), which inherently defines the page layout, fonts and graphic elements as well as the hypertext links to other documents on the Web, Wood does not explicitly teach a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks. Wang discloses a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks (figs. 12-13; page 19, 0200-0202; page 21, 0225; page 30, 0345). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Wang because Wang's portal web page including a hyperlinks would allow the user fast to select a particular device of interest by clicking on the representation of the device (Wang, page 8, 0104).

6. As to claim 5, Wood discloses the web page includes at least one advertisement of a web resource (web page has an inherent functionality that includes advertising hyperlink or banner) that can make use of the interface to access a user's job document when the user is making use of the resource (fig. 4; col. 2, lines 11-17; col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 7).

7. As to claim 6, Wood discloses the web site generates the web page based, at least in part, upon the user's job document (fig. 4; col. 1, lines 47-59; col. 6, lines 1-34).

8. **Claims 7-8, 13-15, 17 and 24-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, in view of Wang, Nagral et al. (US 7,143,109).

9. As to claim 7, Wood discloses a web server computer (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) comprising:

means for receiving a request from a client computer over a network (col. 5, lines 3-6), where the client computer is operated by a user having a personal repository for storing job documents (col. 3, lines 11-22; col. 6, lines 35-40) and the client computer includes an interface for accessing the personal repository (col. 3, lines 11-65, "touch screen operation...select document files from storage...display line indicating the operation selected, the job ID number/storage location for the location"); and

means for responding to the request by sending the client computer at least one Web page (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 45-52; col. 6, lines 1-34).

wherein a Web page (fig. 4) that includes *information regarding* web resource that is available over the network (12, fig. 1), each of the web resources configured to communicate with interface (touch screen) in order to access a user's personal repository (col. 3, lines 11-65, user interface display page for the printer 15...reprint operation gives user the ability to select document files from storage and print hard copy").

10. Wood discloses downloading a user interface software to the client computer (col. 3, lines 1-8). Wood does not specifically use a term application programming interface. Nagral discloses application programming interface (GDI is graphics drawing application programming interface; GDI, fig. 2; col. 9, lines 19-46; col. 2, lines 41-62, "application programming interface"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Nagral because Nagral's API would permit many applications to have access to the database (Nagral, col. 2, lines 41-62).

Wood discloses a web site (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) operable to cause the client to display a web page including *information* each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 1-34, "display of the downloaded document, which could be an initial printer screen page...to provide access to the copier/printer"). Although the web page is built with an html format (col. 5, lines 3-24), which inherently defines the page layout, fonts and graphic elements as well as the hypertext links to

other documents on the Web, Wood does not explicitly teach a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks. Wang discloses a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks (figs. 12-13; page 19, 0200-0202; page 21, 0225; page 30, 0345). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Wang because Wang's portal web page including a hyperlinks would allow the user fast to select a particular device of interest by clicking on the representation of the device (Wang, page 8, 0104).

11. As to claims 24 and 25, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 7 above. In addition, Wood discloses displaying a web page on the client computer that includes a plurality of information (fig. 4).

12. As to claims 8, 13 and 17, Wood discloses the web page includes at least one advertisement of a web resource (web page inherently includes advertising hyperlink or banner) that can make use of the interface to access a user's job document when the user is making use of the resource (fig. 4; col. 2, lines 11-17; col. 3, line 49 – col. 4, line 7).

13. As to claim 14, Wood discloses the web site generates the web page based a characteristics of a job document stored in the user's personal repository (fig. 4; col. 1, lines 47-59; col. 6, lines 1-34).

14. As to claim 15, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 7 above. In addition, Wood discloses wherein each of the web resources configured to make use of the same interface in order to access the personal repository when the user is actively making use of the resource (col. 3, lines 11-65, user interface display page for the printer 15...reprint operation gives user the ability to select document files from storage and print hard copy"; col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 34; col. 6, lines 41-54).

15. As to claims 26-29, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 7 above.

16. **Claims 3 and 4** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, in view of Wang, and further in view of Gopalan (US 2003/0076526).

17. As to claims 3 and 4, Wood discloses a file server for store job documents (col. 2, lines 58-60), and web site (30, fig. 2) includes a memory (37, 39, fig. 2) of information regarding web resources that are available over the network and that can make use of the interface in order to access an active user's job document (col. 4, lines 41-45; col. 6, lines 35-54; col. 7, lines 1-20). However, Wood does not specifically disclose web site including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). Gopalan discloses web site (104, fig. 1) including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood, Wang and Gopalan

because Gopalan's database would reduce operating costs by providing searchable database of online public records (Gapalan; page 1, 0005).

18. **Claims 9, 10, 12 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wood, in view of Wang, Nagral and further in view of Gopalan (US 2003/0076526).

19. As to claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 12 and 18, Wood discloses a file server for store job documents (col. 2, lines 58-60), and web site (30, fig. 2) includes a memory (37, 39, fig. 2) of information regarding web resources that are available over the network and that can make use of the interface in order to access an active user's job document (col. 4, lines 41-45; col. 6, lines 35-54; col. 7, lines 1-20). However, wood does not specifically disclose web site including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). Gopalan discloses web site (104, fig. 1) including a browsable database (106, fig. 1; page 2, 0023; page 3, 0037). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood, Wang and Gopalan because Gopalan's database would reduce operating costs by providing searchable database of online public records (Gapalan; page 1, 0005).

Response to Arguments

20. Applicant's arguments filed 5/15/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(1) Applicant asserts on page 8 of the remark that "The only thing that Wood teaches about printers 15, 15' and 15" accessing print job document storage (e.g., a user repository) is that each printer accesses its own respective file server memory 39. Wood column 2, lines 58-60 and column 4, lines 41-45. Wood decidedly does not teach each printer 15, 15' and 15" accessing the same repository through a common interface".

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., accessing the **same** repository through a **common** interface) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Furthermore, since the claim limitation "interface" recited in claim 1 is not specifically defined in claims, the claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow. Therefore, the examiner can interpret the claimed interface is corresponding to the marking systems supervisors (23, fig. 2). Col. 6, lines 41-54 of Wood explicitly discloses web resources (i.e., printers) can make use of the same interface (23, fig. 2) in order to access the user's personal repository (37, fig. 2).

(2) Applicant asserts on page 8 of the remark that Applicants fail to see how this generalized benefit might somehow be deemed to suggest or motivate using a portal Web page with the printer schema of Wood, in which the user/client transmits documents to the printer via the Internet through a file server. Indeed, it is not at all

apparent how a portal Web page could or should be used in Wood, particularly if one ignores (as one must) the Applicants' disclosure.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Wood discloses a web site (30, fig. 1; 32, fig. 2) operable to cause the client to display a web page including *information* each pointing to a unique Web resource that is available over the network (fig. 4; col. 6, lines 1-34, "display of the downloaded document, which could be an initial printer screen page...to provide access to the copier/printer"). Although the web page is built with an html format (col. 5, lines 3-24), which inherently defines the page layout, fonts and graphic elements as well as the hypertext links to other documents on the Web, Wood does not explicitly teach a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks. Wang discloses a portal web page including a plurality of hyperlinks (figs. 12-13; page 19, 0200-0202; page 21, 0225; page 30, 0345). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Wood and Wang because Wang's portal web page including a hyperlinks would allow the user fast to select a particular device of interest by clicking on the representation of the device (Wang, page 8, 0104).

21. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-3960. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan J. Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2154

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

July 12, 2007

Jungwon Chang
JUNGWON CHANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100